

REMARKS

Amendment to the Specification

The Applicant has corrected some informalities in the specification and also made an implicit
5 statement more explicit. The amendments are made without adding new matter to the
specification.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

The Examiner rejects claims **1-18** under 35 USC § 112 as being indefinite for failing to
10 particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the
invention. Claims **1** and **10** recite the limitation “said coordinates of said atoms of said first
protein and said atomic coordinates of said atoms in said second protein” in steps (d), and (f)
-(g) of each claim and lack antecedent basis. Claims **2-9** and **11-18** are rejected due to their
dependency from claim **1** or **10** and thus containing the indefinite limitation.

15

In reply, applicant has amended claims **1** and **10**. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully
submits that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Objections

20 1. Claims **2-9** are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent format
for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. The examiner points out that
claims **2-9** depend on claim **1** and are directed to a method. However, claim **1** is directed to a
program storage device.

In reply, applicant has amended claims **1-9** and directed these claims to a program storage device. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that the objection be withdrawn.

- 5 2. Claims **1-9** are objected to because of the phrase “comprising of” in claim **1** and its
dependant claims **2-9**.

In reply, applicant has adopted the examiners suggestion and amended claim **1** to
“comprising” instead of “comprising of”. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits
10 that the objection be withdrawn.

3. Claims **1-18** are objected to because the meaning of the steps (a) and (b) of claim **1** and **10**
is not instantly clear. The examiner has suggested that steps (a) and (b) be amended to recite
“receiving the atomic coordinates of.....” instead of “receiving a first protein with N1 atoms”
15 or “receiving a second protein with N2 atoms”.

In reply, applicant has adopted the examiners suggestion and amended claims **1** and **10**.
Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that the objection be withdrawn.

IN CONCLUSION

The Applicant hereby submits a bona fide and timely attempt to correct the non-responsiveness in Applicant's Reply to Office Action 8/26/03 filed on 10/7/03. The reply
5 encompasses also a bona fide attempt to overcome the objections and rejections raised by the Examiner and the reasons why the Applicant believes the objections and rejections should be withdrawn. Accordingly, allowance of the claims now in the application is kindly requested.

Respectfully submitted,

10



Dr. Ron Jacobs
Reg. No. 50,142

15 LUMEN Intellectual Property Services
2345 Yale Street, 2nd Floor
Palo Alto, CA 94306-1429
Phone: (650) 424-0100
Fax: (650) 424-0141
Email: ron@lumen.com